MEETING NOTES | March 8, 2012

Santa Rosa Plain Basin Advisory Panel

Action Items

Timeframe	Name	Action Item
4/1	Parker and Trotta	Work on the printing issues with *Uncommon Innovations*, by Rebecca Nelson

Next Meeting: April 12, 9:00-12:00, at 35 Stony Point Road

- Mission, Goals & Objectives
- USGS Modeling Scenarios
- **Decision** on Governance and Boundary

Date Change: May 10th Meeting Changed to June 7

The Basin Advisory Panel will meet June 7, 9-12, at the Laguna Treatment Facility. The Panel will **not meet May 10.**

Recap of USGS Presentation

Marcus Trotta provided a brief overview of key insights gained through the USGS presentation.

One person expressed concern that the USGS Study didn't make it clear for them how much pumping is occurring and what the impacts of that pumping are. However, the study does present data on overall trends for groundwater levels, an indicator for the basin response to pumping. Panel members are anxious to receive the full report because the summary presentation, which contains many averages, doesn't seem to present the full picture or can tend to "average out" the specifics that would likely be helpful to the group.

Several Panel members raised the issue of land subsidence during the USGS presentation and again at this meeting. Panel member Jane Nielson clarified that a study which USGS conducted on earthquake faults between 1991-2001 showed some subsidence in satellite imagery; however, subsidence was only mentioned in a very short paragraph. Areas that showed subsidence were in the same location as areas of historical declining groundwater levels. Others expressed an interest in exploring this issue further to understand if subsidence is a problem in the plan area. After some discussion, the group agreed to defer the topic to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC will assume responsibility for looking at research issues, such as this, and make recommendations to the Basin Advisory Panel.

One purpose of the groundwater management plan would be to ask questions and develop future studies to address informational gaps needed to best manage

groundwater. The Basin Advisory Panel will need to contemplate land subsidence and other studies as it moves forward.

Next Steps
Ask the Technical Advisory Committee to review research and consider land subsidence as part of the recommendations it develops for the Basin Advisory Panel.

Groundwater Management Framework

During the April-May timeframe, the Basin Advisory Panel will make a decision regarding the boundary and legal framework for the groundwater plan. At this meeting, the Panel reviewed some sample goals and objectives to improve understanding for what other groundwater plans have covered. The purpose of this was to give them a sense of the implications on the boundary and the framework.

The sample goals and objectives doesn't give a clear sense of what water issues the Panel must grapple with even though they must decide on the approach for moving forward. One element of the planning process is to define the types of questions that the Panel must grapple with. The group will have to think about where it wants to go, and then how to get there. Deciding how to get there is more difficult to envision. Initially, the question is what are the goals and objectives for the plan (i.e. where do we want to go), and then the group will have to explore the management actions to achieve those goals and objectives.

A substantial amount of work has gone into putting together the planning effort. The next thing the group will have to do is to define the goals and objectives. This will be followed with developing how to achieve it. Once the group has come up with the "how" it will need to revisit the goals and objectives again to make sure that they have it correct.

Boundary

Although this planning effort is named the *Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Planning* effort, the USGS study has defined the study boundary as the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed. The primary reason for this boundary definition is that much of the recharge occurs in upland areas and in the alluvial fans where the mountains meet the plain. In response to a facilitator request, technical consultant Tim Parker recommended that the Panel chose the watershed boundary due to hydrology and to match the study. Most Panel members noted that they would like to see the boundary be the watershed. One person noted that the Rogers Creek fault seems to be a barrier and the corresponding water budget, i.e. how much water flows through or around the barrier is unclear. Because of this barrier, choosing the watershed boundary may not be necessary. Marcus explained that the DWR basin boundary also goes east of the Rogers Creek Fault, and that some water does move across the fault. The model will help quantify how much water moves across.

Another question was whether to stay with the California Department of Water Resources hydrologic basin as defined in Bulletin 118. Although the Bulletin 118

boundary is the basin, not the watershed, DWR representative Mark Nordberg informed the group that the best practice for groundwater management is to manage the watershed.

Legal Framework

Technical consultant Tim Parker reviewed options for the legal framework. (See Meeting Materials | Presentation). The summary materials compared the framework options to stakeholder interests articulated previously (voluntary, non-regulatory, cost to implement, etc.). Most Panel members are following the recommendations of the Steering Committee and leaning toward the AB 3030 plan. Panel members like that AB 3030 plans leverage funding while also being non-regulatory. Some Panel members' constituents would be very concerned if the Panel chose a regulatory approach. The consensus-building approach used in the Sonoma Valley is very encouraging to one member, and he recommends this as the best option. Finally, some like the simplicity or "gentle nature" of the AB 3030 approach.

Panel members are to keep thinking about the framework and talk to colleagues and neighbors. They will make a decision at their April 12 meeting.

Next Steps

At the April 12th meeting, the Basin Advisory Panel will likely reach a decision on both the boundary and the legal framework. As discussed at this meeting, Panel members are leaning toward the watershed as the plan boundary and to an AB 3030 voluntary, non-regulatory plan as the framework.

Communication & Outreach Plan

The Center for Collaborative Policy developed this plan for feedback. The Basin Advisory Panel suggested the following.

- Consider having elected officials receive briefings at the Russian River Watershed Association meetings; however, Sebastopol would have to agree to attend since it is not a regular member.
- Sue Kelly will have to check with Sebastopol elected officials to determine if they would like to meet with other elected officials either through the Water Advisory Committee or the Russian River Watershed Association. Alternatively, Sebastopol elected officials can receive periodic briefings from Sue Kelly. She will report back to Gina Bartlett.
- Consider recording public meetings so they can be streamlined on the web.
- Recommend using social media as a tool for outreach.

USGS Model Scenarios

The Panel reviewed an initial proposal for how scenarios might be defined for USGS modeling. The scenarios will compare four climate parameters (wet-normal, dry, and 2 climate change alternatives). The scenarios will also consider possible water resource management components, such as decreased or increased groundwater use, increased

conservation, surface water use, recycled water use, stormwater recharge and groundwater banking. The concept behind the scenarios is to "bookend" the range of possible futures to assist with planning.

The Basin Advisory Panel will continue discussing this at its next meeting. Marcus will need to determine how many scenarios USGS is budgeted to run. One initial suggestion was to run the different climate parameters to see how much variance they provided. If the results were not that different, they might want to narrow the number of climate parameters modeled, thus freeing up more runs to model different management scenarios.

Laguna / Mark West Stormwater Management / Groundwater Recharge Study

The Sonoma County Water Agency held a meeting on the Laguna/Mark West Stormwater Management/Groundwater Recharge Study. Marcus Trotta gave a brief overview of the study, which is looking for opportunities in the watershed for projects that can both provide flood control and groundwater recharge. Supplemental project objectives would include improving water quality, ecosystem enhancement, agriculture land preservation, open space preservation, and recreation. The initial phase of this scoping study is nearing completion and results to date were presented at a February 27, 2012, Stakeholder Meeting attended by approximately 30 or 40 people, including a number of Basin Advisory Panel members. In general the study has found that the most promising projects are located in an arc extending from foothills east of Windsor to areas east of Rohnert Park, which are upstream of major areas of flooding and located within favorable groundwater recharge areas. A copy of the stakeholder meeting presentation and a draft Project Screening Technical Memorandum, are available on the project website - http://www.scwa.ca.gov/files/docs/projects/stormwater-groundwater.